

### **REMARKS**

This amendment is responsive to the office action mailed November 3, 2004. Claims 6, 10 and 15-18 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11 and 12-14 remain pending in the application.

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH**

Claims 6 and 17 have been cancelled without prejudice. Minor amendments have been made to claim 11 to more particularly point out that each said portion of said advertising mural forms an integral portion of its associated said panel. It is believed that this removes any possible ambiguity as to claim 11, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B)**

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by "Harvard Cheers Dartboard Cabinet". The Examiner further stated that official notice has been taken that the Cabinet has been in public use in this country since at least 1997. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, it will be noted that independent claim 1 has been more positively amended to recite a "stowage bin" apparatus that is adapted for use on a mobile platform. Claim 1 has been further amended to recite that the second door panel is located laterally adjacent to said first door panel, and where said door panels being arranged so as to be hinged along a common longitudinal edge. It will also be noted that claim 1 as initially presented makes clear that the first and second portions of the image are not removable from their respective door panels.

Such a structure is not shown or suggested by the “Harvard Cheers Dartboard Cabinet” (hereinafter the “Harvard Cabinet”). The Harvard Cabinet appears to disclose some type of cabinet that includes a pair of doors that are not hinged along a common longitudinal edge. This cabinet also does not appear to be suitable for use in a mobile platform as a “stowage” bin.

With regard to claim 5, it will be noted that this claim has been amended to positively recite that the first and second portions of the advertising mural each include an ultraviolet color stable image. There is absolutely no suggestion that the Harvard Cabinet includes an ultraviolet color stable image. Claims 1 and Claim 5 have each been further amended to recite that the first and second stowage bin doors are “hingedly supported along a common longitudinal upper edge” or along a “common longitudinal edge”.

Claim 8 has been amended to positively recite that the advertising system includes a first panel, a second panel and “a third panel also viewable from within said cabin area and disposed laterally contiguous to said second panel, and having a third portion of said advertising mural non-removably formed thereon”. Again, this structure is not shown or suggested by the Harvard Cabinet, which includes only two doors that are not hingedly coupled along a common longitudinal edge.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 2, 6, 9 and 12-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Harvard Cabinet as discussed above, in view of Appel et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,126,112). In view of the amendments to independent claims 1, 5, 8 and 12, it is believed that this rejection has been rendered moot. In addition, the undersigned wishes to point out that Appel et al is directed to a system in which the images are intended to be removed from their respective supporting panels. In fact, Appel et al expressly teaches against forming the images so as to be non-removable from their respective door panels. As such, it is respectfully submitted that Appel et al is not properly combinable with the Harvard Cabinet reference. To highlight this feature, claim 5 has been amended to more positively recite that the first and second portions of the advertising mural are not intended to be removed from their respective said stowage bin doors. The examiner will note that there is nothing regarding the Harvard Cabinet that would suggest to one of ordinary skill the desirability of using a separate set of doors having images formed thereon that cooperatively form a second mural, as set forth in independent claim 8.

In view of these important distinctions, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 12, 2005

By:   
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600  
MDE/jo